

Customer No. 24498  
Internal Docket No. RCA88761 US  
Office Action Date: January 2, 2008

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 20 2008

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 4-17 are pending in this application and are rejected in the Office Action of January 2, 2008. No claim amendments are presented herein. However, a listing of the pending claims is included with this response for the Examiner's convenience.

Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,069 issued to Ludtke et al. (hereinafter, "Ludtke") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,322 issued to Horiguchi et al. (hereinafter, "Horiguchi"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,477,262 issued to Bunker (hereinafter, "Bunker"). Applicants continue to respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants first note that independent claim 1 recites:

"(b) means for providing digital video content;

(c) means for generating, in said peripheral consumer electronic device, digital OSD video data representative of an on-screen display menu associated with said peripheral consumer electronic device; and

(d) means for transferring said digital video content and said digital OSD video data as separate data via said digital bus to said display device, wherein at said display device said digital video content passes through a first signal path which decodes said digital video content to generate decoded digital video content and said digital OSD video data passes through a second signal path which does not decode said digital OSD video data, and wherein outputs of said first and second signal paths are combined so that said on-screen display menu represented by said digital OSD video data is overlaid onto said decoded digital video content." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, amended independent claim 1 defines a peripheral consumer electronic device that provides digital video content and generates digital OSD video data representative of an on-screen display menu associated with the peripheral consumer electronic device. The digital video content and digital OSD video data is transferred as separate data to a display device via a

Customer No. 24498  
Internal Docket No. RCA88761 US  
Office Action Date: January 2, 2008

digital bus. At the display device, the digital video content passes through a first signal path which decodes the digital video content to generate decoded digital video content, and the digital OSD video data passes through a second signal path which does not decode the digital OSD video data. Outputs of the first and second signal paths are combined so that the on-screen display menu represented by the digital OSD video data is overlaid onto the decoded digital video content. Independent claims 7, 9 and 12-14 define the foregoing subject matter in a similar manner. Support for the foregoing claimed subject matter is shown, for example, in FIG. 4 of Applicants' specification.

None of the cited references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the foregoing claimed subject matter. On pages 4-5 of the Office Action dated January 2, 2008, the Examiner admits that Luttko fails to disclose the foregoing claimed subject matter, and relies on Horiguchi to remedy these deficiencies of Luttko. In particular, the Examiner alleges:

"Horiguchi clearly discloses the use of Isochronous transfer mechanism for transferring video content and asynchronous transfer mechanism for transferring digital video data (Fig. 2A-B, el. 21A and 51A; Col. 5, lines 14-47; Fig. 3; Col. 3, lines 54-Col. 4, lines 28) wherein video content is transmitted through a first path at the display device and decoded for display (Fig. 2B; 51B-52-54; column 4, lines 40-51) and wherein digital OSD video data (column 3, line 49-column 4, line 22) is transmitted through a second path at the display device and not decoded ('navigation' data which does not get decoded; 51A-60-57; column 3, line 49-column 4, line 22 and column 4, line 52-column 5, line 3)." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, the Examiner alleges that Horiguchi discloses that data corresponding to the claimed "digital OSD video data" is transmitted through a path at the display device where it is not decoded. In particular, the Examiner alleges that this "navigation" data, which does not get decoded, passes through a path including 1394 asynchronous interface 51A, conversion circuit 60 and system controller 57 of Horiguchi (see FIG. 2B).

In response, Applicants submit that the "navigation data" referred to by the Examiner does not properly correspond to the claimed "digital OSD video data"

Customer No. 24498  
Internal Docket No. RCA88761 US  
Office Action Date: January 2, 2008

which is "representative of an on-screen display menu associated with the peripheral consumer electronic device" (see claim 1). Moreover, the video menu data in Horiguchi which does properly correspond to the claimed "digital OSD video data" does not pass through the aforementioned asynchronous path (i.e., through elements 51A-60-57 in FIG. 2B), as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, the video menu data in Horiguchi which properly corresponds to the claimed "digital OSD video data" passes through the isochronous path (i.e., through elements 51B-52-53-54-55-56 in FIG. 2B) where it is decoded. This aspect of Horiguchi is clearly disclosed, for example, on column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 9 where two different types of video menu data are described, and also in FIG. 3. In particular, the aforementioned passage of Horiguchi discloses VMGM\_VOBS menu data which represents a video object set for a VMG menu (see column 3, lines 56-57), and VTSM\_VOBS menu data which represents a video object set for a VTS menu (see column 3, lines 60-61). Horiguchi specifically describes the VMGM\_VOBS menu data from column 3, line 62 to column 4, line 6 as follows:

"The VMGM\_VOBS is composed of a plurality of VOBS (video object), each VOB is composed of a plurality of cells, and each cell is composed of a plurality of VOBUs (video object unit).

Further, each VOBU is composed of NV\_PCK (navigation pack), V\_PCK (video pack), A\_PCK (audio pack), and SP\_PCK (sub-picture pack). Each pack is composed of 2048 bytes.

Each NV\_PCK is composed of a PCI (presentation control information) and DSI (data search information).

Each V\_PCK is composed of ID.SCR (system clock reference) of the pack and additionally a video data." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, the VMGM\_VOBS menu data in Horiguchi is composed of video object units (VOBUs) which each include video (V), audio (A) and sub-picture (SP) packs, as well as certain navigation (NV) packs which include presentation control information (PCI) and data search information (DSI). The organization and arrangement of the VMGM\_VOBS menu data is visually represented in FIG. 3 of Horiguchi. By comparing the two bottom-most layers of the VMGM VOBS menu data shown in FIG. 3 with the outputs of the 1394 isochronous interface 21B in FIG. 2A (i.e., outputs V, A, SP and NV), it is clearly shown that the VMGM VOBS menu data of Horiguchi is transmitted via the

Customer No. 24498  
Internal Docket No. RCA88761 US  
Office Action Date: January 2, 2008

isochronous path (i.e., through elements 51B-52-53-54-55-56 in FIG. 2B) where it is decoded. Accordingly, Horiguchi fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, that digital OSD video data representative of an on-screen display menu associated with a peripheral consumer electronic device passes through a second signal path which does not decode the digital OSD video data, as claimed. Accordingly, Horiguchi is unable to remedy the admitted deficiencies of Ludtke.

Banker is likewise unable to remedy the deficiencies of Ludtke and Horiguchi. In particular, Banker is cited for allegedly teaching the use of an overlay function in which menu characters are overlaid onto a video image (see, for example, page 5 of the Office Action dated January 2, 2008). However, as shown for example in FIG. 3 and its accompanying description, Banker fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed manner of processing digital OSD video data in which the digital OSD video data passes through a signal path which does not decode the digital OSD video data. Accordingly, Banker is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Ludtke and Horiguchi.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that neither Ludtke, Horiguchi nor Banker, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests a notable feature of independent claims 1, 7, 9 and 12-14, and their respective dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke in view of Horiguchi and Banker, and further in view of P1394 Draft 8.0v2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since the P1394 Draft 8.0v2 is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Ludtke, Horiguchi and Banker pointed out above with reference to claims 1-9 and 11-17. In particular, P1394 Draft 8.0v2 is cited for allegedly disclosing a function control protocol in which a peripheral device transmits a control command and response by asynchronous packet for each asynchronous operation (see page 21 of the Office Action dated January 2, 2008). However, like Ludtke, Horiguchi and Banker, P1394 Draft 8.0v2 also fails

Customer No. 24498  
Internal Docket No. RCAF88761 US  
Office Action Date: January 2, 2008

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 20 2008

to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed manner of processing digital OSD video data in which the digital OSD video data passes through a signal path which does not decode the digital OSD video data. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Lutke, Horiguchi, Bunker and P1394 Draft 8.0v2, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks/arguments, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
Thomas A. Stahl, et al.

  
By: \_\_\_\_\_

Paul P. Kiel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: March 20, 2008